United Nations A/C.1/49/PV.20

General Assembly
Forty-ninth

Official Records

First Committee

20th Meeting
Tuesday, 15 November 1994, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

Agenda items 53 to 66, 68 to 73 and 153 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: As I informed delegations at our meeting yesterday, my intention this morning was to proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 7, that is, A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, L.7/Rev.1 and L.26. However, some delegations have asked for a postponement of decisions on those three draft resolutions. Therefore, action on cluster 7 as a whole will be postponed.

The Committee will therefore proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 8, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.4, L.8, L.12, draft decision L.24 and draft resolutions L.29, L.32, L.35 and L.37.

The Committee will then take up draft decision A/C.1/49/L.46 in cluster 10, entitled "Maintenance of international security," along with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.1, which was submitted to the Committee after the circulation of the Chairman's suggested programme.

Furthermore, I should like to inform you that it is my intention, if time permits, to take a decision on the remaining draft resolutions contained in clusters 3 and 5, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.27, L.18, L.20/Rev.1 and L.21; members will recall that decisions on the latter three draft resolutions had been postponed.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the First Committee): The following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.7/Rev.1, Israel and Ukraine; A/C.1/49/L.39, Panama; A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, Armenia, the Czech Republic, Ireland and Portugal; A/C.1/49/L.8, Nepal; A/C.1/49/L.26, Japan and Swaziland; A/C.1/49/L.22, Lithuania, Mauritius, Portugal and Ukraine; A/C.1/49/L.21, Lithuania and Malta; A/C.1/49/L.12, Brazil; and A/C.1/49/L.27, Malta.

The Chairman: I now call upon delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions and draft decisions.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have the honour, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce draft decision A/C.1/49/L.46, which relates to agenda item 70 and is entitled "Maintenance of international security".

As members will have noted, draft decision A/C.1/49/L.46 is a brief and purely procedural one whereby the General Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its fiftieth session an item entitled "Maintenance of international security". In our view, this decision would help harmonize the positions of States on questions of international security. The sponsors hope that the draft decision will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Whanndu (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African

94-87061 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

States, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2 on the establishment of an African nuclear-weapon-free zone. Canada and San Marino have joined in sponsoring this draft resolution.

As members know, the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa was adopted at the historic Cairo summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held in 1964. Recent developments in Africa and elsewhere have made it possible, with the support of the international community, to begin the effective implementation of the Declaration. The Group of Experts to Draw up a Draft Treaty on the Denuclearization of Africa, set up jointly by the United Nations and the OAU, has as a result been able to carry out its task.

The African States sincerely thank the Members of the United Nations for their financial and material support in drafting this major treaty. Those States have asked me to convey their appreciation to the Secretary-General and, through him, to his able associates for the diligence with which they have helped the OAU organize the meeting of the Group of Experts.

At the request of the African leaders, as stated at their recent Tunis summit, the Group of Experts is to meet once more to put the finishing technical touches to the draft treaty, which will be submitted to them for their approval and adoption. This is why we have before us the present draft resolution, which lays the groundwork for finalizing the text of the draft treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.

The draft resolution is a procedural one, no different to last year's resolution on the subject. By paragraph 8, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to take appropriate action to enable the Group of Experts to meet early in 1995 in order to finalize the drafting of a treaty.

The African States know they can continue to rely on the support of the States Members of the United Nations in getting their plan for effective, concerted action to establish an African nuclear-weapon-free zone down on paper and implemented.

The sponsors hope that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2 will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Mpay (Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): Following consultations with a number of delegations, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1 wish to make the following revision. Paragraph 6 should have the following phrase inserted between the words "States Members" and "to participate": "of the Economic Community of Central African States".

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements, in explanation of vote before the voting, on draft resolutions contained in cluster 8.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): On draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4, entitled "Review of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade", the United States delegation will vote "no" for the following reasons.

Firstly, the review is unnecessary. The Declaration itself called for the international community to make progress in the 1990s by pursuing disarmament in a number of areas. Progress has been achieved in many of these areas, and discussion of other topics continues at the Conference on Disarmament and in other forums. Anyone interested in reviewing progress made since 1990 can read the public record, in the form of United Nations documents and bilateral and multilateral treaties. Also, the First Committee itself annually reviews progress in this area.

Secondly, in an environment of United Nations budgetary restraint, it would be a waste of valuable time and resources to create an unnecessary and duplicative review process.

Finally, the United States objects to the draft resolution's attempt to place this subject on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission. That agenda will be determined by the Disarmament Commission's organizational meeting next month, and should not be prescribed by a First Committee resolution.

Mr. Chandra (India): I should like to explain our vote, before the voting, on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields".

We had hoped that we could have had one resolution on this subject. Regrettably, this has not been possible, as draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 does not recognize the dual aspect of science and technology — their "Jekyll and Hyde" nature: it focuses exclusively on the beneficial effects of science and technology, and ignores their harmful effects. Moreover, it has taken some paragraphs, selectively, from the unfinished report of the Disarmament

Commission, without the balanced paragraphs. We therefore feel that it is an unbalanced resolution. In addition, it contains laudatory references to norms and guidelines for the transfer of high technology. These are euphemisms for ad hoc control regimes, which are unacceptable to us.

For all these reasons, we will be constrained to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution, and we request a recorded vote.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4, entitled "Review of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1994, and it is sponsored by Nigeria and Benin.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Marshall Islands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Argentina, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Samoa, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4 was adopted by 111 votes to 4, with 27 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Zambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 7 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Bolivia, Costa Rica, Honduras, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Ukraine and Venezuela.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.12.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.12, entitled "United Nations

disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Mali, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.12 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.12 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote decision on draft decision A/C.1/49/L.24.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/49/L.24, entitled "Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of vehicles for their delivery in all its aspects", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 9 November 1994, and is sponsored by Mexico.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft decision A/C.1/49/L.24 was adopted by 98 votes to 1, with 42 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Zambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: We will now proceed to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.29. I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation requests that separate votes be taken on the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to vote in accordance with the request of the representative of Iran.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 13th meeting of the

Committee, on 4 November 1994, and is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, South Africa, Sweden and Uruguay.

The Chairman: We shall now vote on draft resolution AC/1.49/L.29.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on the preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Mexico, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 132 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Israel, Mexico, Panama,

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was retained by 129 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution's operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, France, Israel, Malaysia, Mexico, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was retained by 128 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Brazil informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, as a whole, was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Zambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 7 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Nigeria and Sri Lanka.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32 was adopted by 92 votes to 4, with 46 abstentions.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 9 November 1994. It is sponsored by Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and Haiti.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35 was adopted.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37, entitled "Implementation of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 7 November 1994. It is sponsored by Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37 was adopted by 107 votes to 3, with 34 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Germany, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Arnhold (Germany): As a point of order, I should like to ask when delegations will have an opportunity to make explanations of vote on draft resolutions in cluster 8, on which we have just taken action.

The Chairman: I call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. Starr (Australia): I should like, on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, to provide an explanation of our votes on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32, "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security".

Australia and New Zealand regret that they were unable to support this year's draft resolution on this matter, although both countries supported the corresponding draft resolutions in previous years. We were obliged to abstain on this occasion in view of the fact that this year's text runs counter to the constructive, forward-looking approach evident in the related resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, which seeks to promote a solution of the issues raised under this topic by building on the common ground identified in the Disarmament Commission. Australia and New Zealand continue to hope that the two draft resolutions dealing with science and technology can be merged at next year's session of the Committee.

I wish also to make an explanation of vote on resolution A/C.1/49/L.37, "Implementation of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace".

My delegation voted in favour of this resolution in recognition of the fact that, at this year's session of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, in which my delegation participated actively, the Committee was able to overcome some of the political divergences that have beset it in the past and to agree on a report that offers scope for constructive future action. At the same time, we are concerned that the Ad Hoc Committee's credibility will be jeopardized unless it is able to move quickly towards more substantive and focused outcomes that take account of and

are relevant to the emerging currents of practical, cooperative measures in and within the Indian Ocean region.

My delegation notes that the wording of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37 differs from that of paragraph 18 of the conclusions and recommendations section of the Ad Hoc Committee's 1994 report, from which operative paragraph 5 is otherwise drawn. It is our view that the language of the report is a more accurate reflection of the agreed outcome of this year's Ad Hoc Committee session.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): The United States voted against decision A/C.1/49/L.24, "Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of vehicles for their delivery in all its aspects".

Last year my delegation voted against resolution 48/75 C, upon which this decision is based. We voted "No" because we believed that the resolution was not an appropriate or effective vehicle for advancing non-proliferation objectives. Nor did we support the request for a report from the Secretary-General. It was not clear to us what the report was intended to address, what its purpose was or how such a report could further existing efforts. These questions remain unanswered to this day. Consequently, the United States does not support keeping this item on the agenda.

My delegation would like also to explain its abstention in the vote on resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 concerning the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

At its session last spring, the Disarmament Commission concluded its consideration of this subject without reaching agreement on guidelines and recommendations. The Commission reported this result to the General Assembly. Much of resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 represents a selective assortment of elements from a Disarmament Commission conference-room paper that was not agreed and, consequently, has no standing. A number of those elements were, in effect, couched in compromise language that my Government and numerous other Governments were prepared to accept in an effort to achieve consensus in the Disarmament Commission. Since, regrettably, consensus was not achieved, the compromise language can in no way be regarded as agreed.

In addition, resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 makes no reference to existing non-proliferation treaties and arrangements, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the biological weapons Convention. Those treaties and other arrangements have been effective in curbing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. As was emphasized in the Disarmament Commission by the United States and many other countries, including most of the sponsors of the resolution, those regimes deserve the recognition and support of the international community. The United States cannot accept the absence from this resolution of any acknowledgement even of their existence.

For these reasons, the United States believes that resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 cannot contribute to a productive multilateral dialogue on the important issues that it covers.

Before concluding, I must make a more general point. The United States hopes that all members of the Committee realize that the introduction for action by this voting body of what could not command consensus in the Disarmament Commission puts into question the Commission's credibility and viability.

Once again, the United States did not participate in the action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35, which asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. The United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be considered as organically linked. It was for this reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 Conference on this matter.

The United States requests that the record of today's proceedings reflect the fact that the United States did not participate in the consideration of or in the action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35 on the relationship between disarmament and development.

At the same time, my delegation takes this opportunity to state again that the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the final document of the International Conference.

Finally, the United States voted against resolution A/C.1/49/L.37, which concerns the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. My delegation requests your permission, Mr. Chairman, to make an explanation of vote in respect of this draft resolution at a later time.

Mr. Deimundo Escobal (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on the resolution we have just adopted in this Committee,

"The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields" (A/C.1/49/L.29).

We express our satisfaction at the efforts being made in this Committee to maintain a constructive dialogue on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields. My country attaches great importance to science and technology, not only as a source of social well-being and economic development, but also as a significant contribution to the full validity and implementation of arms-control agreements and disarmament in areas such as elimination of weapons, the conversion of military industry for civilian purposes and verification. At the same time, Argentina wishes especially to emphasize that all States must use technology responsibly, and supports the establishment of national and international controls to prevent technology from being diverted to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons to qualitative improvements in them, and to destabilizing effects that threaten international peace and security.

In this respect, in order to avoid having transfers of science and technology with military applications banned, we think it is essential to ensure that such transfers be carried out responsibly under strict controls that will ensure that such science and technology is used for purely peaceful purposes. For this reason, my delegation is committed to the idea of non-proliferation and promotes the development of any non-proliferation regimes and arrangements, whether they be regional or subregional, multilateral or bilateral.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian Federation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.24. Last year we voted against what became resolution 48/75 C, which is referred to in the draft resolution. We take the view that, as has been demonstrated in practice, the consideration of the problem of non-proliferation in such a context does not serve the purposes of strengthening the non-proliferation regime relating to nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. On the contrary, it weakens it. As a result, we do not think it rational that the provisional agenda of the next session of the General Assembly should include this item.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I wish to explain the position of my delegation in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32, "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security".

This draft resolution is closely related to the one we have traditionally sponsored with other delegations, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", but in the past they were always kept to different dimensions of the same issue. This year we were not able to support draft resolution L.32, because of its last preambular paragraph, which includes language that is part of the main efforts towards which draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 was directed. We do not believe that we can deal with the question of access to technology exclusively with legal treaties; we also need, as is well stated in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution L.29,

"universally acceptable norms and guidelines".

Mr. Arnhold (Germany): I would like to explain the vote of the German delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4, entitled "Review of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade".

Germany was able to vote in favour of this draft resolution, in view of its general support for the idea of reviewing the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade. This, however, was done on the understanding that the operative paragraphs of draft resolution L.4 are not intended to predetermine the possible results of the usual procedure of deciding on agenda items for the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Weston (United Kingdom): I speak on behalf of the delegation of France as well as that of the United Kingdom in order to explain our abstentions on the draft resolution that the Committee has adopted, the text of which is contained in document A/C.1/49/L.29, on "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields".

Our two delegations continue to believe that the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament is a subject of great significance to the international community, where the broad cooperation of all States Members of the United Nations is necessary in order to achieve the desired goals. In this respect, we note with regret that, despite the considerable effort that has been devoted to the subject in the Disarmament Commission and the General Assembly in years past, the international community has not been able to agree on guidelines for the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

The discussions at the Disarmament Commission in 1994 were difficult, but we were close to achieving consensus. Unfortunately, the refusal of a small number of delegations to recognize existing legal commitments undertaken under relevant multilateral treaties and international agreements, as well as the misguided belief that qualitative improvements in weapons technology could be only detrimental to global security, led to a breakdown of the consensus and the failure of the Commission's work on this item.

Draft resolution L.29 draws selectively from some of the paragraphs discussed by the Disarmament Commission earlier this year. We recognize the attempt to find compromise language, but we regret that the text of the resolution does not reflect the existence of the large body of international treaties, legal instruments, agreements and international legislative measures which all seek to contribute to the enhancement of the role of science and technology in the context of international security. We should like to point in particular to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the biological and toxin weapons Convention and the chemical weapons Convention, all of which address the issue of the transfer of high technology related to weapons of mass destruction. It is inconceivable to our delegations that any conclusions on the role of science and technology in this field could ignore these fundamental pillars of non-proliferation.

Similarly, we believe that it is the responsibility of all States to support these international instruments by adopting and implementing national export-control measures.

The United Kingdom and France are disappointed that the text omitted such references, since we were prepared to consider the possibilities offered by this draft resolution if it could have secured an acceptable compromise leading to consensus. It was our hope that we could move further towards consensus this year. To permit this, however, the text needed to recognize the importance of adherence to existing legal commitments and their implementation. Because it failed to do so, France and the United Kingdom concluded reluctantly that their positions could be reflected accurately only by an abstention.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields".

My delegation did not participate in the vote on the similar draft resolution last year. We hoped that the sponsors would consider our views and the views of some other delegations this year. Unfortunately, that was not the case, despite the fact that my delegation provided the sponsors with some alternative paragraphs.

We believe that an important issue that has not been resolved in the Disarmament Commission in the course of four years' intensive negotiations cannot be resolved in a single General Assembly resolution. We fully associate ourselves with the views expressed by the representative of India on these draft resolutions, and I do not intend to go into the details; however, we are of the view that in the field of the transfer of science and technology for peaceful purposes, the international community should adopt a forward-looking approach.

The existing legal treaties do not adequately ensure the transfer of science and technology for peaceful purposes. Even their modest provisions are subject to contradictory interpretations. Therefore, we strongly believe that the General Assembly initiative on the adoption of norms and guidelines for the transfer of science and technology — I refer to the seventh preambular paragraph — or the adoption of national measures, which in our view are actually export-control measures, should have included the suggestion that Member States should review their national measures and ensure their full compatibility with international law regulating the transfer of high technology with military applications, seeking to ensure that such transfers do not undermine international peace and security, that access is not denied to high technology product services and know-how for peaceful purposes and that all existing restrictions against the States parties are removed through multilaterally negotiated disarmament treaties.

We also believe that the General Assembly should have expressed the view that cooperation in this field between supplier and recipient States must be promoted on the basis of commitments embodied in multilaterally negotiated agreements, to prevent transfers of high technology with military applications for peaceful purposes from being diverted to non-peaceful uses, and that such cooperation should be based on clearly defined and balanced rights and obligations, appropriate measures of transparency and verification, equity, fairness and predictability of incentives and so on.

We also abstained on the draft resolution as a whole, for the reasons that I have just explained and because the

sponsors have attempted to compile non-consensus elements of a Disarmament Commission document.

Finally, we hope that the sponsors of these draft resolutions will continue their negotiations with interested delegations, in order to bring positions closer and have a consensus draft resolution on this issue, perhaps in coming years.

Mr. Kunda (Zambia): My delegation was not present when action was taken on a number of draft resolutions and the draft decision in cluster 8, under the rubric of "Other disarmament measures". I wish to put on record that, had we been present, we would have voted in favour and joined the consensus where applicable.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to cluster 10, draft resolutions on international security. We have received a request to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.1. The Committee will therefore proceed to take a decision on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/49/L.46.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/49/L.46, entitled "Maintenance of international security", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 15 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

I hear no objection; I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.46 was adopted.

We now return to cluster 5 and the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1, as orally amended by the representative of Cameroon in today's meeting.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The revised draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1, which was orally amended by the representative of Cameroon, was introduced by the representative of Cameroon at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 7 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Kenya, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, and Zaire.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

I hear no objection; I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): This afternoon's meeting will be cancelled, to permit representation to continue the process of consultations and negotiations on the draft resolutions that are still outstanding. I request that this process of consultation and negotiation be speeded up as far as possible so that the Committee may take the necessary action as early as possible.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.